UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/AC.96/SR.463-470/Corrigendum
13 August 1992

ENGLISH

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE PROGRAMME OF THE UNITED NATIONS
HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR REFUGEES

Forty-second session

SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE 463rd to 470th MEETINGS

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
from 7 to 11 October 1991

Corrigendum

The present document contains the corrections made by the delegations and the Secretariat to the English text of the summary records of the meetings held by the Executive Committee of the High Commissioner's Programme at its forty-second session (A/AC.96/SR.463-470).

With the issuance of the present corrigendum, the summary records of the above meetings are to be considered as final.

GE.92-02269/5014H (E)

468th meeting

Paragraph 89, line 1

The name of the speaker should read Mr. MOUSSALLI

469th meeting

Paragraph 49, line 3

After worsen insert in the short term

Paragraph 50

The name of the speaker should read Mr. SEMICHI

Paragraph 82, 83 and 86

For the existing text substitute

82. Mr. ILICAK (Turkey) said that Turkey had intervened in Cyprus by virtue of its rights and obligations under the Guarantee Treaty of 1960 to protect Turkish Cypriot people and preserve the independence of the island. He was unwilling to embark on a political discussion when purely humanitarian matters were under consideration. As reconfirmed by the Security Council in its resolution 649 (1990), the Cyprus question was an integrated whole. Hence, attempts to single out certain aspects of the Cyprus question and to pretend to seek solutions in a forum where one of the two sides was unfortunately not represented was tantamount to the exploitation of humanitarian issues for purely political propaganda purposes. However, it must be recalled that, in 1958, before the independence of the island, again in 1963 and until 1974, in spite of the presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus, Turkish Cypriot villages and quarters of the towns had been attacked and destroyed. Thus, the Turkish Cypriots were forced to be displaced in over 40 enclaves scattered around the island but which covered only 3 per cent of the territory. After the coup d'etat of 1974, of which the objective was well known, both Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots left their homes and took refuge in what they considered to be safer areas. The persistently hostile attitude of the Greek Cypriots left no alternative but to regroup the two peoples into two separate zones. However, the Greek Cypriot representatives had to date failed to refer to the Agreement on Voluntary Exchange of Populations, reached in Vienna in 1975 between the leaders of the two peoples of the island. In view of the voluntary character of the population exchange as well as the bi-zonal character of the envisaged solution in Cyprus, one had to admit that the question of displaced persons had been fundamentally resolved. Displacement in the context of the Cyprus question did not mean misplacement. For that reason, humanitarian assistance to affected populations on both sides could not be construed or presented with a view to claiming the return of the displaced persons to their original settlements. Such a claim would be inconsistent with Security Council resolution 649 (1990) which underlines the bi-zonal character of the envisaged federation.

83. The Turkish delegation considered that to take into account only the population as the principal criterion, that was to say the demographic elements instead of the real needs and common projects, was contradictory not only to the norms of equity, but, at the same time, to the principles of ultility - the rational use of available resources. Indeed, taking into consideration the economic realities of the island, it was neither possible for this delegation to understand nor to accept the allocation of 81 per cent of the said funds to the so-called development of the Greek Cypriot part of the island, where the per capita income was over $10,000. The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus was indeed in much greater need of that assistance; benefits from it would only contribute to the further broadening of the gap which existed between the economic development levels of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and the Greek Cypriot Administration of Southern Cyprus. Such an approach which defied economic rationale would certainly have political consequences as well, since it not only contributed to the widening of the economic gap between the two communities but also rendered more difficult the achievement of integration within a federal framework. For that reason, his delegation was of the opinion that such an approach would be inconsistent with the efforts launched in finding a political solution to the Cyprus question acceptable to the parties involved. If it was the desire of the donor countries to genuinely contribute to the settlement of the Cyprus question, it was incumbent upon them to exert efforts towards diminishing the economic gap which existed between the two communities by taking into consideration the real needs of the Turkish Cypriot people and by granting them more substantial assistance. It seemed that UNHCR continued to take demographic factors only as criterion, instead of real needs, which had until now only contributed to the further enrichment of the Greek Cypriots and which would have no impact on the development process of the Turkish Cypriot side and consequently would be considered as insignificant by the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, thus leading it to decline from presenting any new projects in the forthcoming period.

86. Mr. ILICAK (Turkey) said that in Cyprus there had always been two different peoples, separated by language, traditions, culture and ethnic origin. There was no Cypriot nation. Greek Cypriots were on record as having said that the agreements giving independence to Cyprus in 1960 had created a State but not a nation. In Cyprus, the two peoples had always coexisted within a dual social structure. Physical separation was caused by Greek Cypriots in 1963 when they launched an all-out attack against the Turkish Cypriots. The "green line" in Nicosia had been drawn by a British General in 1987 to protect Turkish Cypriots against Greek Cypriot aggression and violence. With regard to human rights violations, he wished to draw attention to the fact that since 1975, the Turkish Cypriot people had been facing an increased inhuman embargo imposed upon them by the Greek Cypriots in the economic and cultural fields which had negative bearings on the economic and social development of the Turkish Cypriot people. He did not wish to engage himself in a political debate when purely humanitarian matters were under consideration. For that reason, and not to waste the time of the Executive Committee, he would not reply to the customary unfounded political allegations formulated by the Greek Cypriot side.